## ASSESSMENT OF 3D MODELING FOR ROTOR-STATOR CONTACT SIMULATIONS

Mikhael Tannous <sup>1\*</sup>, Patrice Cartraud <sup>1</sup>, Mohamed Torkhani <sup>2</sup> and David Dureisseix <sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> GéM, Ecole Centrale de Nantes, mikhael.tannous@ec-nantes.fr
<sup>2</sup> LaMSID UMR EDF-CNRS-CEA 2832, EDF R&D, Clamart Cedex, mohamed.torkhani@edf.fr

<sup>3</sup> Université de Lyon, LaMCoS, INSA de Lyon, CNRS UMR5259, david.dureisseix@insa-lyon.fr

Key words: rotor-stator contact, 3D modeling, penalty, rotor dynamics, finite elements.

Transient dynamic simulations of accidental slowing down of turbines with rotor-stator contact interactions are dealt with in the literature mainly by means of 1D models [1]. However, for a better understanding of local non linear phenomena, a 3D model of the contact zone is necessary. After developing a coupled 1D and 3D model approach to save computation time for rotor dynamics problems with non linearities restricted in space and time [2], this paper aims at illustrating the contribution of a 3D finite elements modeling of the rotor-stator contact interactions. This is achieved by comparing the results of a 3Dfinite elements model of a rotor-stator contact problem with those obtained by a simplified 1D model.

In order to make a relevant comparison between a 3D modeling of a rotor-stator contact problem and a 1D model, the 1D and 3D models of the rotor and of the stator are built in such a way that the natural frequencies, behaviours and responses to an unbalance are practically the same for both 1D and 3D models. Thus, the only differences are due to 1D and 3D contact modeling differences.

Three application examples illustrate the contribution of the 3D model. In the first application the stator is constituted of a simple ring having its outer surface fixed. In the second application, the stator and its blades are modelled as shown in fig. 1. This same model is used in the third example in which the rotor rotates at its critical speed. The applications examples are inspired from real industrial problems. The dimensions are those of a true EDF nuclear park turbine.

Comparing 1D and 3D rotor orbits, as illustrated in fig. 2, shows a small difference between the 1D and the 3D contact approaches. In other words, from a global point of view, the 1D and the 3D models are equivalent. However, local effects are observed on the 3D stator. This is not the case in 1D models. Fig. 3 highlights the displacement differences of the same physical point belonging to the 1D and the 3D stator models, along the stator's tangential direction at that point. It shows a significant difference between



Figure 1: 3D model of the rotor-stator system



Figure 2: Orbits of the 3D rotor and the beam rotor Figure 3: Displacements comparison of a point belonging to the stator

the stator behaviors depending on the contact approach being used (1D or 3D modeling). Stator behaviors make it obvious that the contact friction torque is overestimated in 1D models. The main cause lies in the rigid body cross-section assumption in a beam modeling used in the 1D model.

This research work highlights the necessity of a 3D model for a more accurate simulation of a rotor-stator contact problem.

The application examples are conducted on the industrial finite element code Code\_Aster using penalty contact algorithms. A comparison with Abaqus/Explicit is in progress.

Acknowledgements: The authors thank the French National Research Agency (ANR) in the frame of its Technological Research COSINUS program.(IRINA, project ANR 09 COSI 008 01 IRINA)

## REFERENCES

- S. Roques, M. Legrand, P. Cartraud, C. Stoisser and C. Pierre. Modeling of a rotor speed transient response with a radial rubbing. *Journal of Sound and Vibration*, Vol. 329, 527–546, 2009.
- [2] M. Tannous, P. Cartraud, D. Dureisseix and M. Torkhani. Bascule d'un modèle poutre à un modèle 3D en dynamique des machines tournantes. 11ème Colloque national en calcul des structures, CSMA 2013, Presqu'île de Giens, Var, 2013.